UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2447th MEETING: 27 MAY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2447)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);	
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2447th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 27 May 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. M. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2447)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
   Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Maudave (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2439th to 2444th and 2446th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Hadj Azzout (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Joseph (Australia), Mr. Hashim (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Adjibade (Benin), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Trucco (Chile), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Davin (Gabon), Mr. Blain (Gambia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mrs. Jones (Liberia), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Traore (Mali), Mr. Marin Bosch (Mexico), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Bolokor (Nigeria), Mr. Cabrera (Panama), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Senegal),

Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Stevens (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Owiny (Uganda), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bassole (Upper Volta), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Malaysia in which he requests to be invited to take part in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, pursuant to the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Tan Sri Zainal Abidin (Malaysia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 26 May from the representatives of Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe [*S/15799*], which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation, under the provisions of rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Johnstone F. Makatini, representative of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) to participate in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

7. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should also like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 26 May from the representatives of Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe [*S/15800*], which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation, under the provisions of rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Lesaoana S. Makhanda, representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), to participate in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

9. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them document S/15795, which contained the text of a letter dated 26 May 1983 from the representative of Panama addressed to the President of the Council [*S/15795*].

11. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, Mr. Yaqub-Khan, whom I warmly welcome.

12. Mr. YAQUB-KHAN (Pakistan): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity of addressing the Council while you are presiding over it. Our two countries have a long tradition of friendly and co-operative relationships which we deeply cherish.

13. I feel confident that with the benefit of your widely acknowledged qualities of statesmanship and diplomatic skill, the Council will be able to take important decisions to ensure earlier independence for Namibia. Let me avail myself of this opportunity to express our appreciation also to Mr. Umba di Lutete who guided the work of the Council earlier during this month with great distinction and success. At the same time, I wish to pay a warm tribute to Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick for her valuable contribution to the work of the Council during her presidency last month.

14. I am participating in this important debate in compliance with the mandate entrusted to me and to several of my other colleagues by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983. I also do so in order to give expression to the abiding commitment of the people and the Government of Pakistan to the cause of Namibian independence. Being a country which has experienced the sufferings of colonial subjugation, Pakistan is dedicated to the cause of decolonization and the struggle of peoples for self-determination and independence. It is, therefore, a matter of pride for us to be able to make a contribution to the advancement of the cause of Namibian independence. We are willing to make every endeavour within the limits of our capacity and our resources to bring this noble objective closer to realization.

15. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a richly deserved tribute to SWAPO, which, under the leadership of Mr. Sam Nujoma, has brilliantly led the people of Namibia in their heroic struggle for the liberation of their country. Their struggle is just and its triumph inevitable.

16. The United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the independence of Namibia when the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory in 1966 [*resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*]. Soon after, the Council became involved with the process of Namibian independence and in March 1969 adopted resolution 264 (1969) which recognized the termination of South Africa's Mandate, described the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia as illegal,

and called upon the Pretoria régime to withdraw immediately its administration from Namibia. In the following years, the Council, while firmly maintaining that South Africa's administration of Namibia was illegal, rejected all attempts by South Africa to alter the status of the Territory or to impose on it a settlement of its choosing or to call in question Namibia's unity and territorial integrity.

17. The endeavours of the Council to promote the independence of Namibia further matured in its resolution 385 (1976) which demanded that South Africa withdraw its illegal administration from the Territory and transfer power to the Namibian people and called for free elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations. On the basis of this resolution, the then five Western members of the Council worked out a proposal for the peaceful settlement of the situation in Namibia [*S/12636*]. Subsequently, the Council endorsed this settlement plan in its resolution 435 (1978), which was accepted both by South Africa and by SWAPO. The resolution also envisaged the establishment of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) for Namibia.

18. The settlement plan embodied in resolution 435 (1978) enjoyed universal acceptance and raised hopes for an early solution of the Namibian question that would bring to a close the dark chapter of colonial subjugation. Regrettably, these hopes proved to be ephemeral.

19. Soon after the adoption of the plan, South Africa resorted to deceitful manoeuvres aimed at frustrating its implementation. The real intentions of the Pretoria régime became starkly evident at the pre-implementation meetings held at Geneva in January 1981 where South Africa refused to discuss a date for the implementation of the settlement plan and accused the United Nations of partiality. Thereafter, it raised unwarranted demands relating to constitutional arrangements and electoral procedures clearly designed to impede the process of independence of Namibia.

20. The Pretoria régime further stepped up its unreasonable demands by linking the progress on Namibian independence to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. It is not difficult to recognize this entirely irrelevant condition for what is: a transparent machination devised to prolong South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to delay the independence of the Territory.

21. The Pretoria régime has been deservedly ostracized by the international community as a lawless entity which has imposed the inhuman *apartheid* system in South Africa and is determined to maintain its colonial stranglehold over Namibia in order to continue its plunder of the Territory's rich natural resources and its policy of aggressive militarism against the neighbouring front-line States.

22. As the fate of the United Nations settlement plan continues to hang in the balance, South Africa has intensified its ruthless repression of the Namibian people and the economic exploitation of their land. At the same time, it has escalated acts of armed aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring States. Lesotho and Mozambique have been the latest targets of Pretoria's wanton raids in which scores of innocent people were massacred and valuable property destroyed.

23. The question arises why a régime, universally condemned for its inhuman policies and practices, continues to defy the will of the international community. The answer to this question lies in South Africa's insolent reliance on the good will and tolerance of some of the members of the Western contact group who have openly acquiesced in Pretoria's intransigence and obstructionist attitude towards Namibia's independence. The protection available to South Africa, such as demonstrated by the triple veto exercised to prevent mandatory sanctions against it when the Council met in April 1981, has emboldened South Africa to continue its occupation of Namibia and its aggression against the African States. Yet another factor that has compounded South Africa's arrogance is its growing military strength, which has become the principal vehicle of its terrorism and aggression in the region.

24. The concern of the States Members of the United Nations over the delay in Namibia's independence, their indignation at South Africa's intransigence and their dissatisfaction with the lack of progress in the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan has been repeatedly expressed with clarity and with firmness in the United Nations. The position was reaffirmed by the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries at New Delhi last March. These countries have consistently maintained the following.

25. First, the only basis for negotiation for the solution of the Namibian question is the settlement plan approved in Council resolution 435 (1978). This plan must be implemented without delay.

26. Secondly, the Namibian question is a question of decolonization. It must not be linked with any aspect of East-West confrontation, specifically, the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, which is an entirely extraneous issue. We appreciate the position taken by France in this regard and have also noted that the statement made in the Council by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Western contact group [*2439th meeting*] refrained from raising this question.

27. Thirdly, stepped-up aggression by South Africa is a clear proof of unwillingness to abandon its illegal hold on Namibia. Determined action rather than a policy of appeasement is the appropriate prescription for the settlement of the Namibian question. This was the conclusion reached at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April.[1]

28. Even if the role of the Western contact group in the evolution of the settlement plan is acknowledged, the ambivalent position taken by some of its members since

the ill-fated pre-implementation meeting of 1981 at Geneva has created doubts about its will and capacity to pursue faithfully the implementation of the plan. The members of the group have manifested excessive deference to South Africa's interests; even outright support for the latter's unreasonable demands has not been lacking. Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, has strongly maintained that the group has lost contact with the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978) and that its recent endeavours appear to be a mere rescue operation for Pretoria.

29. It is a matter of great regret that the Western contact group has not been able to fulfil the expectations which its formation five years ago aroused. We are aware of the complexity of the situation and of the obstacles to be overcome on the path to Namibian independence. We do not believe for a moment, however, that these obstacles are insurmountable. The continuing sterility of the contact group's efforts has caused the erosion of its credibility.

30. In these circumstances, the Council must re-assume its responsibility for the implementation of the settlement plan. Given purposeful co-operation among the Council's members, that implementation should not take long to materialize. The Secretary-General's report [*S/15776*], which has explained the developments in the negotiating process with great clarity, points to the encouraging progress already made in securing a large measure of agreement on modalities to be employed in the implementation of the plan. According to the Secretary-General, as far as the United Nations is concerned, the only outstanding issues are the choice of the electoral system and the settlement of some final problems relating to UNTAG and its composition. Furthermore, SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, has reaffirmed its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to ensure the smooth and peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. This assurance was reiterated in unequivocal terms by Mr. Nujoma at the 2439th meeting in his important statement before the Council.

31. I wish to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his admirable and untiring efforts in the search for a settlement of the Namibian question, which reflect his firm commitment to the cause of Namibian independence. His persistent endeavours, which have served to sustain the hope of the international community for the success of the negotiating process, deserve the highest praise.

32. The Council must now define a time-frame within which the Secretary-General should make contact with the parties concerned in order to finalize the arrangements for Namibia's transition to independence. If efforts to ensure the implementation of the United Nations plan continue to be thwarted by South Africa, it will be only by taking appropriate measures, such as those envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to secure South Africa's compliance with resolution 435 (1978) that the Council will be able to discharge its responsibility towards Namibia.

33. The negotiations on Namibia's independence cannot be allowed to become a protracted process. The struggle for Namibia's independence has entered a decisive phase where firm and meaningful action by the Council can alone bring early success. The persistence of the current impasse would lead only to more bloodshed and to a widening of the conflict, which would entail grave consequences for regional and global peace and security. Any further delay in securing Namibia's independence would deepen the pervasive sense of frustration and mistrust which provides the seed-bed for conflicts and crises afflicting many parts of the world.

34. The participation in these meetings of the Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs from a large number of countries of various regions of the world underlines international concern over Namibia's fate and the gravity of the situation created by South Africa's continued stranglehold on the Territory. We hope that the Council will be able to take decisions that will be instrumental in bringing about the early fulfilment of the collective commitment to independence for Namibia.

35. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, Sir, allow me to welcome warmly your participating in and presiding over these important meetings of the Council. We all admire the skilful manner in which you have guided our deliberations in the past few days.

36. We have listened carefully to the statements of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of many African and other third-world countries, as well as to those of Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO and other representatives. I wish, in the name of the Chinese delegation, to welcome warmly the participation of the distinguished Ministers for Foreign Affairs and of Mr. Nujoma in the meetings of the Council and to express deep appreciation for their positive and valuable contributions to our deliberations.

37. The Council has resumed its consideration of the situation in Namibia at the request of the African Group and the Non-Aligned Movement. That is entirely necessary. The non-implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) and the continued stalling of the plan for the independence of Namibia have aroused strong dissatisfaction and indignation among African countries and peoples as well as serious concern in the international community. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, in March [*see S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49*] and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April,[2] both adopted solemn declarations calling on the Council to take vigorous measures to ensure the prompt implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia affirmed in resolution 435 (1978). This justified demand has been reiterated by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and representatives

who have spoken in the past few days, and should by no means be ignored by the Council. There should be no further continuation of the situation in which the Council takes no decision after considering an issue or fails to enforce a decision it has adopted.

38. On the eve of the Council's consideration of the matter, the Secretary-General submitted a further report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia [*S/15776*]. This is a concise report reflecting the actual situation. The Chinese delegation wishes to join many other delegations in expressing appreciation to the Secretary-General for his great efforts in pressing for the implementation of the United Nations plan.

39. Nearly five years have elapsed since the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), and yet this solemn resolution is still no more than a piece of paper. Why is that? Evidently, the responsibility does not lie with SWAPO or the front-line African States, which, on the contrary, have made unremitting efforts towards the independence of the plan and whose reasonableness and constructive attitude have been highly appraised by the international community.

40. The crux of the problem lies with the total lack of good faith on the part of the racist régime of South Africa to solve the question of Namibia, and that explains why resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented thus far. In the past few years, that régime has resorted to tricks of all kinds, endlessly raising extraneous issues in the course of the negotiations and putting one obstacle after another in the way of the implementation of the resolution. In the meantime, it has stepped up the brutal suppression of the Namibian people's struggle for independence in an attempt to break the armed forces led by SWAPO. On the other hand, it has intensified its efforts to foster puppet forces on behalf of an "internal settlement". It has, moreover, repeatedly launched large-scale military invasions, or carried out sabotage or subversive activities, against neighbouring African States. Even now it is occupying a part of southern Angola.

41. Just a few days ago, the racist régime struck again, and this time it launched a savage air raid on Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, flagrantly violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. This is another serious crime committed by the South African authorities against the African people. The Chinese delegation hereby voices its utmost indignation and strong condemnation of this outrage.

42. The South African authorities have done all this in order to perpetuate their illegal occupation of and colonial rule over Namibia so that they may continue permanently to appropriate and plunder the rich natural resources of the Territory and to oppress and exploit the Namibian people. Hence, the South African authorities are not only the culprits undermining peace and stability in southern Africa but also a menace to world peace and security. As the Secretary-General correctly points out in his report:

> "It is evident that the delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) is having a destructive impact not only on Namibia itself but also on the prospect of a peaceful and prosperous future for the region as a whole. The delay also has an adverse effect on international relations in a wider sphere, adding to the prevailing sense of frustration and mistrust, with all that that implies for peace and security in the region." [*ibid., para. 16.*]

43. It should be stressed that the South African authorities would not have been so truculent and intransigent had it not been for the connivance and support on the part of a super-Power. That super-Power, in order to maintain its vested interests in the region, embraces the South African authorities as an "ally" and pursues a so-called constructive engagement policy towards it, and prevents the Council from imposing any sanctions on South Africa. Moreover, it has colluded with South Africa by linking Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. This unreasonable linkage has seriously hampered the implementation of the United Nations plan. As the Secretary-General points out in his report, these issues "were neither raised nor envisaged at the time when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted or in the subsequent negotiations under United Nations auspices. These issues now apparently constitute the main reason for the delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan" [*ibid., para. 19*].

44. It is only natural that the linkage has met with severe condemnation from the Namibian people and African nations and with the strong censure of the international community. Even its allies have refused to endorse the linkage.

45. The Chinese delegation supports the position of SWAPO and the front-line African States on this question. We oppose the linkage between Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Independence for Namibia is an inalienable right of the Namibian people; it is a problem of decolonization. It has nothing to do with the question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The two different issues should not be linked together. As regards the so-called regional security arrangement, it is common knowledge that none of the independent African States adjacent to South Africa constitutes a threat to the security of South Africa. On the contrary, it is South Africa, by its constant invasion and subversion, that is threatening and undermining its neighbours and disrupting the peace and stability of southern Africa. Therefore, the so-called regional security arrangement is nothing more than an ill-concealed device to sustain Pretoria's racist and colonialist rule, and also to preserve its own vested interests. It is our view that the five Western Powers should take a stand conducive to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), rather than doing anything that smacks of condoning South Africa's stalling tactics.

46. The Chinese Government and people will, as always, firmly support the just struggle of the Namibian people led by SWAPO and that of the African front-line

States and we shall provide them with assistance within the limits of our capability. We are of the view that the Council should fulfil its responsibility by accepting the justified demand voiced by many African and other third-world countries during the meetings of the last few days, and by taking effective measures for the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978) so as to speed up Namibian independence. We believe the Council should: first, again strongly condemn the South African authorities for continuing their illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of United Nations resolutions, and demand that they implement Council resolution 435 (1978) unconditionally; should they continue to procrastinate or obstruct the implementation of the resolution, appropriate actions against them should be considered under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations; secondly, reaffirm resolution 435 (1978) as the sole basis for the settlement of the Namibian question and reject any linkage between Namibian independence and extraneous issues such as the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola; thirdly, authorize the Secretary-General to take effective steps to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and request him to report to the Council within a specified time; fourthly, call on the international community to render stronger support and assistance, politically, morally and materially, to SWAPO and the African front-line States.

47. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want progress—this is an irresistible trend of history. Namibia—the largest remaining colony on earth—will one day join the international community as a new independent State. Any attempt to obstruct the decolonization of Namibia is doomed to failure.

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Bolokor, the Minister of State for External Affairs of Nigeria. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. BOLOKOR (Nigeria): Let me begin my statement, Sir, by extending to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Given your previous experience as Zaire's Ambassador to the United Nations, before your elevation to the well-deserved position of Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, and the outstanding contribution which you made to the United Nations while serving here, I have absolutely no doubts that you will acquit yourself creditably in your exalted position as President of this most important body. It is also appropriate that these crucial and important meetings of the Council on Namibia should take place under the presidency of an African State Member of the United Nations.

50. I should also like to extend, through you, our gratitude to your colleagues in the Council for affording us this opportunity to participate in the Council's deliberations on this occasion.

51. The objective of these meetings and our mission here is to seek justice and freedom for the long-suffering people of Namibia. The mandate for this mission derives from the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March, which decided that, in the light of the prolonged delay in implementing Council resolution 435 (1978), an urgent meeting of the Council was now called for. [*See S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para.* 49.] That decision, fully endorsed by over 100 States Members of the United Nations and recently approved at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April,[2] was taken with all due sense of responsibility. There were two basic reasons for that decision to request an urgent meeting of this Council.

52. First, for nearly two decades now—since both the General Assembly and the Security Council first voted to terminate racist South Africa's Mandate in Namibia—racist South Africa has refused to withdraw from the Territory, in open and arrogant defiance of the United Nations. Throughout this period, every effort to reach a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question has been spurned by the racist régime of South Africa. Racist South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia represents an open challenge to the authority of the Council, which clearly calls for punitive measures.

53. Secondly, in its desperate effort to cling to Namibia, the racist régime of South Africa has plunged the whole of the southern African region into a *de facto* state of war by its increased and irresponsible armed attacks on the neighbouring front-line States. The primary aim of these unprovoked military attacks, which the racist régime of South Africa has sought to justify on grounds of hot pursuit, is simply to intimidate and destabilize those States, in the misguided and mistaken belief that they will abandon their support for Namibia and for its sole authentic and legitimate representative, SWAPO. The southern African region is now embroiled in an undeclared war with very ruinous consequences for the fragile economies of those States.

54. Racist South Africa is clearly in breach of the purposes and principles of the United Nations as enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. Its aggressive and expansionist policies, which are amply demonstrated by the incessant wave of murderous military attacks on its neighbours and the wanton destruction of life and property brought about by those attacks, now require a prompt and effective response from the Council.

55. International peace and security have been gravely endangered by those unprovoked and irresponsible armed attacks by racist South Africa on its neighbours. It is the Council which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Charter empowers it to act, and failure to do so can only further damage and undermine the authority of the Council and the United Nations system as a whole. Africa expects firm and decisive action from the Council.

56. The tragedy which has for several decades now been unfolding on the world stage is, indeed, a calamity.

First, owing to a fit of absent-mindedness, Namibia was taken from a rapacious German colonial administration and handed over to the Boers of South Africa, whose penchant for brutality is unparalleled in the annals of mankind. Then, at the end of the Second World War, the United Nations—in an equally mistaken and ill-considered manner—extended racist South Africa's Mandate over the Territory at a time when the obnoxious racist doctrine of the Boers had begun to rear its ugly head.

57. Is it any wonder, then, that the Boers—who contributed little or nothing to the war effort, but who were immediately rewarded with the spoils of the war—should immediately extend their abhorrent and inhuman practices to the mandated Territory of Namibia? Equally, is it any wonder that they should proceed to an unprecedented plundering of the natural resources of that Territory? Would we now have to contend with racist South Africa's effrontery and its brazen attempts to hold on to Namibia today, had the Boers been called to order before now? By failing to act to protect the interests of the oppressed people of Namibia and by covertly—and, in some cases, overtly—conniving at racist South Africa's oppressive policies in Namibia, the Western Powers bear a heavy moral responsibility for the untold hardship, suffering and brutality to which the people of Namibia continue to be subjected by the South African racists.

58. Let me recall that, in 1978, the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) as the basis for Namibia's independence by an overwhelming majority. Racist South Africa also announced its acceptance of the plan publicly. The peace plan embodied in that resolution was the result of prolonged and very difficult negotiations, in which SWAPO made many concessions, often under pressure from African States. There were no corresponding concessions by racist South Africa. Africa nevertheless felt that the overriding factor and consideration must be Namibia's speedy and uninterrupted transition to independence. We believe, as we do today, that resolution 435 (1978) provided an honourable way out of this tragic problem.

59. But what happened at the Geneva pre-implementation meeting in 1981? Racist South Africa reneged on its commitment to the peace plan in a most despicable and treacherous manner.

60. Of course, racist South Africa, in reneging on the Namibia independence plan, did not act alone. In fact, it clearly did so in response to the encouragement and support of the new Administration in Washington which, on assuming office, publicly declared that some aspects of resolution 435 (1978) needed to be renegotiated. Soon after that, friendly visits were exchanged at the official level by Washington and Pretoria, including military exchanges and collaboration. It was soon explained to the world that Washington had taken up a policy that it calls constructive engagement with the racist régime of South Africa, which had already been castigated by the whole of the international community as an outlaw. There is nothing constructive about United States policy in southern Africa, nor is it even an engagement. It is a policy of abject surrender to the international outcasts whose primary objective remains the destruction of the United Nations and of world peace and order.

61. We, in concert with the front-line States and SWAPO, have tried as best we can to co-operate fully with the so-called contact group to resolve all outstanding constitutional and other problems relating to the United Nations plan for Namibian independence on the basis of resolution 435 (1978). Since the Geneva talks, we have for our part discharged fully our obligations as responsible Members of the United Nations in seeking a negotiated and peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. In entering into negotiations with the so-called contact group, we acted in good faith and in the belief that a negotiated settlement is preferable to the bloody conflict in Namibia. At every stage of those delicate and difficult negotiations we were given assurances by the Western group of five that the parameters of those negotiations were the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) and the independence of Namibia. As far as we are concerned, the negotiations have been completed. We are not prepared to enter into any discussion with the contact group on any matters outside the scope of the Namibia independence plan. The contact group, by not publicly repudiating the United States position on linkage, has damaged beyond repair its moral credibility on these matters.

62. In this connection, I should like to commend the Secretary-General for his forthright report in which he states that:

> "In the course of the period under review . . . it became increasingly clear that other issues were becoming a factor in the negotiations on Namibia. These issues, which are outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978), had not been raised or envisaged in previous negotiations on that question." [*S/15776, para. 11.*]

63. This is the crux of the matter: the independence of Namibia is being sacrificed on the altar of mistaken strategic perceptions by the United States. This is a most regrettable and unfortunate position which does nothing to enhance the so-called strategic interests of the United States in Africa. In fact, we reject any notion or idea that any Powers have any strategic interests in Africa which warrant the delay and obstruction of Namibia's independence.

64. Let me repeat what I have said on another occasion on this all-important question. We do not seek confrontation with any Power. We want peace in our continent, but not peace at any price, and we shall never give up the struggle for the liberation of Namibia. Together with the rest of the international community, we in Nigeria will continue to support SWAPO and the people of Namibia fully in their legitimate and just struggle for freedom. Nothing will deter us from this honourable commitment.

65. In conclusion, let me appeal once again to all the members of the Council to act swiftly while there is still time to save Africa and the world from a ghastly war. The Council is fully empowered to act. It is the ultimate

defender of the oppressed, the weak and the enslaved. It is the Council which has primary responsibility for international peace and security. It should act now, for it may be too late tomorrow.

66. Mr. de La BARRE de NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): Allow me to say how pleased and honoured we are at seeing you, Sir, presiding over our work during this debate to which my country attaches particular importance.

67. I should also like to welcome the presence in this chamber of many Ministers for Foreign Affairs, especially the Ministers of the front-line countries.

68. My delegation has listened very attentively to their statements. We wish to pay a tribute to their spirit of compromise and to the high ideals expressed in their views.

69. Lastly, I should like to say to the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, how touched my delegation was by the terms in which he spoke of my country's position on the question of Namibia.

70. This debate is not only important, it is also timely.

71. It is important because the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, have a special and even a unique responsibility towards Namibia and its people.

72. It is timely because the constructive negotiations that extended from the autumn of 1981 to the autumn of 1982 did not result, as everyone was hoping, in the rapid implementation of the settlement plan. It is therefore legitimate and fortunate that the Council today is taking stock of what has been accomplished and is reflecting on the ways in which it can reinitiate its action and that of the Secretary-General.

73. I shall not refer to the past. Others before me have done so, especially the Secretary-General in his remarkable report [*S/15776*]. My delegation particularly values its lucidity and frankness. We fully endorse the analysis contained in it and all its conclusions.

74. In connection with the present situation, France's position is known to everyone here. It was defined in the clearest way by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Claude Cheysson, one month ago in Paris, at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[3]

75. Our position has not changed since then and will not change. It can be expressed in a few words: Namibia's accession to independence and the implementation of Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) cannot be impeded by external considerations. Those resolutions, which commit all Members of the United Nations, are complete in themselves. They must be implemented fully, as adopted, without conditions or prerequisites.

76. That is why my delegation can see only advantages in having the Council, at the conclusion of our debate, give the Secretary-General a mandate that would enable him to resume contact with all the parties concerned to ensure the effective implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

77. Looking beyond the near future, we should already be reflecting on the problems that will remain once the United Nations settlement plan is implemented in Namibia. Here I have in mind the security and development of the region, to which the Secretary-General referred in the last paragraphs of his report.

78. In this connection, I should like to refer to the two suggestions made one month ago at the Paris Conference by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, for they directly concern the United Nations and, in particular, in respect of the first suggestion, the Security Council. Mr. Cheysson, referring first of all to the problem of security, said the following:

> "France does not underestimate the legitimate concern of each country of southern Africa to ensure its security. However, we are surprised that there are some who are concerned only with the security of the strongest, richest and best armed State of the region, while we feel that the threat is greatest for the weakest, most disadvantaged and least well-armed countries. . . .
>
> "The desire to ensure the present and future security of each State of the region (I am thinking of Namibia) is legitimate and must be satisfied. . . . for each country, and particularly for Namibia, to decide alone and in full sovereignty what it feels should be done to strengthen and ensure its security. France is prepared to support the actions of the Security Council to ensure strict respect in the area for the rights and commitments of each country, and even to endorse situations which are recognized in the region in so far as one or more countries of that region freely proposes such a step or the Council decides on such a step. This of course cannot be considered in the case of Namibia until the day when, independent and provided with a representative Government, the new State seeks the support of the international community to protect the international status it has freely accorded itself.
>
> "The second disturbing . . . problem of the future which must be considered at the present stage is that of the development of the peoples of southern Africa, who have been most severely affected by the years and decades of disturbances, occupation and war. Significant development assistance has already been provided by France, directly and through the intermediary of the European Community . . .
>
> "This course must be resolutely continued. I therefore suggest that in support of the settlement plan for Namibia, the United Nations should envisage a reconstruction plan covering several years to which the principal donors of aid, States, agencies and institutions,

would undertake to contribute. This proposal must apply also to the countries most seriously affected by the deplorable and unjust prolongation of the occupation of Namibia; we are thinking in particular of Angola which has not known one day of peace since its independence and has been the object of murderous raids, serious destruction and even partial occupation because its people came out in solidarity with the neighbouring people of Namibia.

"It is appropriate to discuss all these matters at the present stage. The United Nations has a role to play in this consideration and this preparation. However nothing can or should be done without a formal proposal by the country or group of countries concerned. Above all, nothing should delay the settlement in Namibia according to the terms . . . of the Security Council resolution . . ."[4]

79. Bearing in mind the security problems that I have just mentioned, I cannot conclude without referring to the deadly air raid by South Africa against Mozambique. As soon as my Government was informed of that attack it published the following communiqué:

"France condemns the South African raid against Mozambique. Nothing can justify this aggression against the independent State and friendly Republic of Mozambique. France reaffirms its condemnation of the system of *apartheid*, which, through its violation of human rights engenders a deplorable cycle of violence and reprisals."

80. Today a sinister chain of events seems imminent. Frustrations are mounting. Despair is deepening. More and more lives are being lost. Soon the violence may become widespread. While we are still on the brink, my country makes another solemn appeal, above all, to South Africa: nothing will be resolved by force, either in Namibia or elsewhere. In that Territory and outside it, the time for peace has arrived.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

82. Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Allow me first, Sir, to congratulate you on assuming the responsible post of President of the Council and to express the conviction of our delegation that your active and wise leadership will promote a constructive discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. I should like to convey the gratitude of my delegation to you and all the other members of the Council for having given us this opportunity to set forth the position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of Namibia.

83. Seventeen years have passed since the United Nations first assumed direct responsibility for bringing Namibia to full independence. During that period, the United Nations has adopted numerous decisions and resolutions on the question of Namibia and made considerable efforts to resolve the matter, once and for all, in a just manner.

84. Five years ago the Council adopted the well-known resolution 435 (1978), which, in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the world community, should have served as the foundation for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

85. However, all these decisions and resolutions continue to be defiantly ignored by the racist régime in South Africa and to this very day Namibia remains in a state of illegal occupation with the situation daily becoming worse.

86. The Pretoria régime is constantly escalating its military potential and its presence in Namibia. According to some data, the strength of the South African force in Namibia is 100,000, that is, one member of the punitive expeditionary force for every 12 Namibians. The policy of Namibianization of the war is being continued by the racists, and the so-called South-West Africa Territorial Force has been operating in Namibia since 1980. Also, the racists in Namibia are served by thousands of mercenaries recruited from former Southern Rhodesian troops and from certain Western countries. They are there for only one purpose: to make it impossible for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, to come to power and to make it possible for them to continue to plunder the rich natural resources of that country.

87. South Africa's purposes are also served by the continuing policy of cruel repression, arrests, imprisonment without trial, torture and the mass slaughter of the peaceful inhabitants of the country.

88. A particular threat to peace and security not only in the region but in the world as a whole results from the fact that the Pretoria régime has turned Namibia into a military springboard for aggressive sorties against the front-line States in pursuance of its increasingly obvious desire to destabilize those States. It continues to commit acts of aggression against southern Angola, which has been occupied for more than a year now, not to mention the completely unprovoked raid recently carried out on the capital of Mozambique. Mongolia strongly condemns this new barbaric act of aggression, which has caused destruction and the death of peaceful inhabitants of that country, emphasizing once again the seriousness of the situation in this region and the need to restrain these fanatical racists.

89. The position of Mongolia on the question of Namibia is well known. Our solidarity with the peoples that are struggling for their freedom, independence and legitimate national rights and our support for their struggle stem essentially from the fundamental and intrinsic essence of our foreign policy. A message dated 27 May from the Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic, Mr. Tsedenbal, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Batmonh, to the leaders of the Organization of African Unity

(OAU) on the twentieth anniversary of African Liberation Day, expresses firm support for the struggle for the African peoples against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, and for the cause of peace, national independence and social progress. It also expresses our conviction that the imperialist efforts to undermine and disunite the OAU will be firmly rebuffed.

90. The Government and people of Mongolia are constant in their support of the struggle of the people of Namibia, under the militant leadership of SWAPO, for their inalienable right to national independence, freedom and self-determination. We firmly condemn the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and the policy of delay and subterfuge pursued by the racists and their overseas protectors.

91. We categorically reject the attempts of Pretoria and its allies to link or to draw a parallel between the granting of independence to Namibia and the question of withdrawing Cuban troops from Angola. It is patently absurd to assert that there is any link whatsoever between those two matters. A limited contingent of Cuban forces is in Angola at the official request of the legitimate Government of Angola in view of the threat that exists to the independence and sovereignty of that newly formed State. If any troops are to be withdrawn from Angola, it should be the South African racist forces which still continue to occupy part of that country.

92. It is more than time for specific steps to be taken to settle the Namibian problem. It is perfectly obvious now that the notorious racist plans for an internal settlement and the spurious efforts of the so-called contact group will yield no positive results. The purpose of those manoeuvres is quite obvious: to delay any solution of the Namibian problem for as long as possible.

93. That is indicated by the unambiguous statements that have been made by the representatives of South Africa and by Western representatives. In particular, after agreement was reached during his visit to Washington in December last on the emplacement on the territory of South Africa of cruise missiles of the Tomahawk type which can carry nuclear warheads, Mr. Botha stated: "This will make it possible for us to intimidate not only neighbouring States but all African States." The Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Mr. Luns, also stated: "South Africa should be given responsibility for directly protecting Western interests in Africa." It could hardly be put more plainly than that.

94. Mongolia regards as very important and timely the initiative of the non-aligned countries in asking that the Council be convened immediately to consider the question of further steps to implement the plan to bring Namibia to complete independence, which would mean that the Council would be discharging its major responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). That initiative reflects the considerable alarm felt by the world public concerning the state of affairs in the southern part of Africa, particularly on the matter of granting independence to Namibia. That is also referred to in the Paris Declaration on Namibia adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[1]

95. The international community expects decisive action from the Council. It should now fulfil its responsibility without any further delay. Mongolia will support any efforts in that connection to establish a definite timeframe for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

96. At the same time, we continue to believe that it is high time comprehensive mandatory sanctions were imposed against the racist régime in South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Upper Volta, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. BASSOLE (Upper Volta) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for having granted my delegation's request to be allowed to participate in this debate, thus giving my country, the Upper Volta, an opportunity to make its modest contribution in the search for a solution to the problem now before us.

99. First of all, I should like to perform the agreeable duty of conveying to Mr. Sam Nujoma and, through him, to SWAPO and all its militants, the brotherly greetings of the people of the Upper Volta, its People's Salvation Council and its President, Mr. Jean-Baptiste Ouedraogo.

100. I wish to assure you, Sir, that it is a genuine pleasure for me to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Your outstanding qualities as an experienced diplomat and statesman committed to dialogue are, I am convinced, a guarantee that the work of this Council will proceed smoothly, and lead us to hope that there will be a successful conclusion to these debates.

101. I also wish to take this opportunity to convey to Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, the representative of the United States, my delegation's gratitude for the competence and sense of responsibility she demonstrated in guiding the work of the Council during the month of April.

102. It is more than 15 years since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. When it adopted, on 27 October 1966, resolution 2145 (XXI), in which it stated its conviction that the administration of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa had been conducted in a manner contrary to the Mandate conferred upon it by the League of Nations in December 1920, to the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the General Assembly was indeed right. This was recognized and confirmed by the

Council itself when it adopted resolution 264 (1969) in order to remind South Africa that its Mandate over Namibia had been terminated and to inform the Pretoria régime that therefore the time had come for it to withdraw its administration from the Territory. However, nothing was changed as a result of that, and it was then necessary to request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, which was handed down on 21 June 1971.[5]

103. The failure of all these steps to produce any results shows clearly that South Africa defies the international community and scorns the resolutions and decisions of our Organization.

104. Thus, each day we move farther away from those resolutions and decisions, allowing South Africa to believe that it can continue to ignore them when it is not defying them.

105. We owe South Africa's refusal to comply to the complicity of certain Western countries whose immediate economic interests are given precedence over the noble cause of the Namibian people and neutralize all political will. It is precisely the political will of those countries that we need to put an end to the intractibility of the racist régime of Pretoria, to the shameful exploitation of Namibia and the suffering of the Namibian people whose only fault is that of aspiring, as all other peoples do, to the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

106. Instead of that political will, what are we offered? Some want us to rely on a contact group whose action falls far short of what we were entitled to expect. Others want us to establish a link between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, a free, independent and sovereign country.

107. We are pleased to note that the international community reacted negatively to the question of linkage, because what they are really trying to do by that unacceptable amalgam is to force us further away each day from the implementation of the settlement plan and make us forget Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). At times it would seem that common sense is not the world's best distributed asset.

108. My delegation feels that we have no miracle cure to foil these Machiavellian attempts.

109. The courage, determination and foresight with which the Secretary-General determined, from the very beginning of his term of office, to tackle the problem of Namibia, gives my delegation reason to believe that the time has come to strengthen his role even more, in order to ensure that Namibia is placed, or rather, is placed once again under the sole responsibility of the United Nations. My delegation wishes to congratulate him on the objective and realistic report [*ibid.*] that he submitted to us at the beginning of these meetings.

110. We believe, like many previous speakers at these meetings, that, in order to save time and be effective, the negotiations, as well as the search for solutions for implementing the settlement plan, should take place, as in the past, exclusively within the framework of the United Nations.

111. In that way, and in that way alone, the efforts made to arrive at a just, lasting and equitable solution to the Namibian problem will no longer be unilateral, because we must note that, thus far, of the two parties directly concerned with the problem, SWAPO alone has shown its constant goodwill and readiness. I wish to pay a tribute to SWAPO for its flexibility and its sense of restraint, which has been evident to all of us throughout the negotiations.

112. Strengthening the role of the Secretary-General would not in itself, however, suffice to open the way to implementing the settlement plan. My delegation is fully aware that the determination of the Council, guarantor of international peace and security, united and strong, will contribute a great deal. Furthermore, its credibility is at stake. May it be even more aware of this and act in such a way as not to disappoint the hopes placed in it.

113. Hence, in our view, the results of the Council's deliberations at the end of these meetings will have two important aspects: to reaffirm the will of the Council to assume its full responsibilities, whose importance everyone is aware of, and to open the way for breaking the deadlock in which the Council now finds itself and which involves a threat to international peace and security.

114. It is also for the Council, through its relevant decisions, to affirm its determination to support and strengthen the role of the Secretary-General.

115. In conclusion, I wish to pay a particular tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the dedication and seriousness with which it assumes its difficult responsibilities. I wish to assure it that the co-operation of the Upper Volta will not be lacking until the triumph of the just cause of the Namibian people.

116. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before adjourning this morning's meeting I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 26 May from the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States [*S/15792*], which reads as follows:

> "We have the honour to refer to the messages addressed on 24 May to you and to the representatives of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States by Mr. L. J. Barnes and Mr. J. G. A. Diergaardt, requesting the opportunity to address the Security Council on the situation in Namibia. In accordance with the usual practice of the Council in inviting persons whom it considers competent for the purpose to supply it with information, we request that, in the course of the current discussion of the Council concerning the situation in Namibia, an invitation under rule 39 of the provi-

sional rules of procedure be extended to Mr. Barnes and Mr. Diergaardt. We would, of course, similarly support applications from other persons competent for the purpose who request the opportunity to speak at the meeting in order to supply the Council with information on this matter."

117. In accordance with the request in the letter I have just read out, I intended to put this proposal to the vote. But following consultations with the members of the Council, it is my understanding that no one insists upon a vote on this matter.

118. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): Mr. President, with respect to the letter that you have just read out, I wish to say, on behalf of my Government and of our contact group colleagues who are members of the Council, that we believe certain issues of principle are involved. The first concerns the implementation of the Council's own provisional rules of procedure, in this case rule 39, which provides that persons competent to provide information or otherwise assist in the examination of a matter before the Council may be given the opportunity to speak. The second concerns the responsibility of the Council to reflect in its own practices the principles of fairness, openness and evenhandedness which are central to the purposes of the United Nations.

119. The members of the contact group believe it to be important that the Council, which by its previous decisions has engaged itself to seek the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia, provide the opportunity to those who will be parties to those elections to present their views; simply that the Council hear them and listen to them.

120. That, Mr. President, is why we have made this request, through you, to the members of the Council. After further consultations, however, and in the light of all relevant circumstances, we do not at this time insist that the question be put to the vote.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

[2] *Ibid.*, para. 193.

[3] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), annex II, sect. A. 3.

[4] *Ibid.*, paras. 42-46.

[5] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—March 1991—2,050